REMARKS

In response to the office action dated 5/29/03 requesting restriction, Applicants provisionally elect to prosecute claims 6-9, 11-14 and 16-21 which the Examiner has identified as Group II.

However, Applicants' attorney protests the Examiner's restriction requirement.

Claim 6 and claim 1 both call for a wave energy converter (WEC) comprising:

(a) a shell mounted about a piston forming a combination which when placed in a body of water is responsive to waves in the body of water for producing relative motion between the shell and the piston;

(b) a mechanical motion to electrical energy converter, including an electric generator, responsive to the relative motion between the shell and the piston for producing electrical power at an output of the electric generator;

(C) means coupling a load to the output of the electric generator, and

(d) wherein the shell has a length, L, and wherein the electric power produced at the output of the electric generator is a function of the length of the shell.

In addition to elements (a) –(d) listed above, claim 6 calls for the load to have an impedance whose value is a function of the period of the waves and of the mass of the water in the shell.

In addition to elements (a) –(d) listed above, claim 1 recites that the electric power produced at the output of the electric generator is also a

function of the depth of the body of water in which the shell is placed and the length of the shell and calls for the length of the shell to produce at least a predetermined output.

Thus, claim 6 and claim 1 only differ in that: (i) claim 6 calls for the load to have an impedance whose value is a function of the period of the waves and of the mass of the water in the shell; **and (ii) claim 1 recites that the electric power produced at the output of the electric generator is also a function of the depth of the body of water in which the shell is placed and the length of the shell and calls for the length of the shell to produce at least a predetermined output.**

Claim 7, dependent from claim 6, includes the limitations of claim 1 and of claim 6. Therefore claim 7 is similar to claim 1 except that the load in claim 7is selected to have an impedance whose value is a function of the period of the waves and of the mass of the water in the shell. Clearly, claim 7 is a species of claim 1 and is not a distinct inventions. Likewise, claim 8 corresponds to claim 2; Claim 9 corresponds to claim 3; and Claim 10 corresponds to claim 4. **[Note: Claim 10 is to be amended to depend from claim 7.]** Consequently claims 1-5 should be examined at the same time and in the same case as claims 7-10.

Claim 11 depends from claim 6, claim 12 depends from claim 7 which depends from claim 6, claim 13 depends from claim 8 which depends from claim 7, and claim 14 depends from claim 9 which depends from claim 7. Claim 15 depends from claim 10 which is to be amended to depend from claim 7. Thus, claims 10 and 15 should be examined together with the other claims of Group II.